Sandy Bacik

From: Sandy Bacik
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2012 5:34 PM
To: csctgtesting@nist.gov
Subject: CSWG Testing & Certification minutes from 20120306

Our twiki site: http://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sggrid/bin/view/SmartGrid/CSCTGTesting
Co-Leads: Nelson Hastings (nelson.hastings@nist.gov)

20120306 Minutes
1. Current tasks
   a. We reviewed the currently posted comments resolutions (https://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sggrid/pub/SmartGrid/CSCTGTesting/Assessment_Guide_Comments_and_Resolutions_2012012b.xls) and the current Assessment Guide (https://collaborate.nist.gov/twiki-sggrid/pub/SmartGrid/CSCTGTesting/NISTIR_7628_Assessment_Guide-v0p9-02112012.doc).
      i. The appendix comments were reviewed by Vicky as to the comment being editorial or context changing.
      ii. For all changes to Appendix B, the same changes will need to be made to the companion spreadsheet.
      iii. We continued the review of the Assessment Guide body comments:
         1. Comment #50 had consensus on the call to disagree with the last two sentences of the first paragraph. We already say update the security plan in the last sentence of that paragraph and we will change leadership to management and adding risk posture.
         2. Comment #55 had consensus on the call to accept the comment change.
         3. Comment #54 had consensus on the call to globally review and update to be consistent with "Smart Grid information system owner".
         4. Comment #51 had consensus on the call to reject the comment change.
         5. Comment #53 had consensus on the call to refine Figure 1 and Vicky Pillitteri presented an updated Figure 1 that had consensus on the call to accept.
         6. Comment #96 had consensus on the call to add a footnote in the introduction to address the comment concern.
         7. Comment #59 had consensus on the call to accept the comment change.
         8. Comment #56 had consensus on the call to refine Figure 1 and Vicky Pillitteri presented an updated Figure 1 that had consensus on the call to accept.
         9. Comment #52 had consensus on the call to refine Figure 1 and Vicky Pillitteri presented an updated Figure 1 that had consensus on the call to accept.
         10. Comment #140 had consensus on the call to ensure that spell checker is run on the final document.
         11. Comment #141 had consensus on the call that the title will contain "cyber security" and the body of the document will contain "cybersecurity" to match the NISTIR 7628 spellings.
         12. Comment #95 had consensus on the call that we will reference the companion spreadsheet, it is unknown at this time as to where, probably in the beginning, like the Appendix B, Executive Summary and Introduction right before footnote 8.
         13. Comment #11 had consensus on the call that we will change the title to "Guide for Assessing the High-Level Security Requirements in NISTIR 7628".
         14. Comment #14 had consensus on the call to use the updated template from the SGIP Administrator which did not include this modification.
         15. Comment #41 had consensus that this was added in the new Executive Summary.
      iv. We continued the review of the Appendix comments:
         1. Comment #115 had consensus on the call to rewrite 2.1(i) to match NISTIR 7628 with having policies and procedures for remote access documented.

2. Comment #116 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
3. Comment #117 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
4. Comment #118 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
5. Comment #119 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
6. Comment #120 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
7. Comment #121 had consensus on the call for SG.AT-2.1 to reject the change for (i) - no, to accept the change for, and to accept the change for (iii).
8. Comment #122 had consensus on the call to accept the comment change.
9. Comment #123 had consensus on the call to accept the comment change.
10. Comment #124 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
11. Comment #125 had consensus on the call that the comment was to prescriptive and does not match the NISTIR 7628 requirements, so the change was rejected.
   v. We will start the Appendix review with comment #126 on our next call.
2. Open Items
   a. We said good bye to Sandy Bacik.
   b. If you would like to assist Nelson Hastings in co-chairing this subgroup, please contact Marianne Swanson (marianne.swanson@nist.gov).
3. Attendees
   a. Marianne Swanson
   b. Nelson Hastings
   c. Robert Sargent
   d. Sandy Bacik
   e. Scott Shorter
   f. Shrinath Eswarahally
   g. Vicky Pillitteri

Regards,
Sandy Bacik, CISSP, CISM, ISSMP, CGEIT
Principal Consultant
EnerNeX
p: 865.696.4470
e: sandy.bacik@enernex.com // www.enernex.com